

CONSERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING JUNE 17, 2008
E. CURTIS AMBLER ROOM

These minutes are not verbatim, but represent a summary of major statements and comments. For minutes verbatim, refer to audiotape on file in the Office of the Town Clerk. Audiotapes are retained for the minimum period required under the retention schedule as provided under Connecticut Law.

Chairman Block called the roll call at 7:00 p.m. and noted Commissioners Igielski, Pappa and Shaffer present. Also present were Alternates Harlow and Turgeon and Mr. Anthony Ferraro, Town Engineer.

NOTE: Chairman Block designated that Alternate Harlow would vote for vacant position and Alternate Turgeon would vote for Commissioner Shapiro.

ITEM III
ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of May 20, 2008

Commissioner Igielski noted the following corrections:

- A. Page 2---Remark "B" should read "The TP & Z cannot (not) act on a pending...of the approval".
- B. Page 3---ITEM VA should read ITEM VI A.
- C. Page 3---Remark "C" should read "There is a 48 inch pipe...at the north end".

Motion made by Commissioner Pappa to accept the minutes as corrected and was seconded by Commissioner Igielski. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM IV
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

ITEM VA
Election of Officers (Commission Secretary)

No action was taken to fill the position.

Motion made by Commissioner Shaffer to table the item over to the July meeting and was seconded by Alternate Harlow. There was no discussion. Vote was 6 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VB

NEW APPLICATION 2008-5, Driveway Improvements at 3333 Berlin Turnpike

Commissioner Igielski noted that he is an employee of Northeast Utilities and therefore would reclude himself from participating on the application.

Mr. Tom Bulzak, P.E. and L.S. and assisting Sargis Associates on the application entered the following remarks into the record:

- A. The project calls for the reconstruction of the existing driveway from Pane Road approximately 1250 feet (northerly and easterly) into the property. The scope of work calls for new pavement with curbs and drainage.
- B. A permit was issued in 2005 where a (major) drainage ditch was installed along the northerly property line. In addition, some new drainage improvements were installed with a hydrodynamic separator on the outlet line that drained into the wetland.
- C. New drainage improvements would include three (3) new catch basins (2 at Pane Road and the other at Station 2+50) and under drain along certain sections of the driveway.
- D. Only a portion of the new construction lies within a regulated area. The wetland boundary limits are shown on the site plan together with the limits of the (100 foot) upland review area. All work would be done within the upland review area.
- E. A new four (4) inch high Cape Cod type curb would be installed to reduce the limits of grading.
- F. The 2005 Permit included a scheduled maintenance program for drainage facilities.
- G. The existing drainage leak off would remain under this project.
- H. The proposed catch basins at Pane Road would be maintained by Northeast Utilities per requirements of 2005 Permit.
- I. Typical sediment and erosion control details were reviewed. Catch basins would have two (2) foot sumps. Silt sacks would be placed in catch basins during construction.

Commissioner Shaffer asked the following questions:

- A. What type of vegetation exists along the driveway today? Mr. Bulzak responded grass and brush.

- B. How long would the (silt) fence remain in place? Mr. Bulzak responded as long as it takes the area to stabilize.

Chairman Block asked the following questions:

- A. How would the road be maintained during the winter to prevent pollutants from entering into the wetland? Mr. Bulzak responded the two (2) existing catch basins installed (above Station 5+00) under 2005 Permit picks up flow and sends it through (hydrodynamic) separator.
- B. Why not put (flow from) lower catch basin into watercourse? Mr. Bulzak responded it could not be done because there is a lack of room to perform the work.
- C. Why not do remediation on wetland else where on the property and pipe the channel? Mr. Bulzak responded the scope of work does not impact the watercourse and therefore the status quo should be left in place. The catch basins being installed would represent an improvement.

Commissioner Shaffer asked if the existing road has curbs? Mr. Bulzak responded no.

Mr. Ferraro said that the new catch basins with two (2) foot sumps should have a trap in it.

Mr. Bulzak said that based on the discussion tonight, the leak-off should be closed.

NOTE: Mr. Igielski returned as a voting member.

ITEM VI A

Draft Application Form

NOTE: Commissioner Pappa left meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Block asked if any member of the Commission had any further recommendation(s) to submit for consideration at this time?

Commissioner Shaffer submitted a marked up copy of three (3) pages for review.

There were no further remarks on the subject matter.

ITEM VI B

Stacking of wood on Styles Avenue

Chairman Block asked if any member of the Commission visited the property? There was no response.

Chairman Block asked if anyone had an opinion on the matter? Mr. Ferraro responded that he considers the activity to be a local business man whose business fronts on Liberty Street that brings cut down trees onto the property, cuts them up and then sells the wood. It is his opinion that the activity does not come under the purview of the Commission.

Chairman Block asked if the stacking of the wood posed a flooding problem? Commissioner Igielski responded the pile is not corded and in his opinion is no problem for a regular flood.

Commissioner Shaffer noted that he visited the site and observed a man splitting wood and adding it to the pile.

Chairman Block asked if there has been any response yet (to party that made the complaint)? Mr. Ferraro responded only as Town Engineer, and not the Commission.

Commissioner Igielski asked if the original complaint went to the Town or the Commission? Mr. Ferraro responded to the Commission, Town and Town Engineer. He noted that he talked with party by e-mail and stated that as Town Engineer he did not regulate a business. He then received a fax that was sent to the Commission.

Commissioner Shaffer said it appears that this is a matter for the TP & Z and Health Department (Central Connecticut Health District).

Chairman Block asked do we not respond and let Town Engineer's response take care of it? Commissioner Igielski responded let Town Engineer's response stand as well as for the Commission in that the Commission did not find anything within its purview.

ITEM VI C

Charter Revision Commission

Chairman Block said that he and Mr. Ferraro appeared before the Charter Revision Commission last week and noted that the following matters were discussed relative to Section 6.07 of the Town Charter:

- A. There is no functionality as to its wetland authority.
- B. Commission can review activity of other agencies and make recommendation(s) and/or advise. He suggested that something be put in Charter to allow the Commission to provide a response.

Chairman Block noted that the bottom line (if "B" above is implemented) would be the build up of a volume of work (that could slow down a project approval process).

Mr. Ferraro said that he talked to TP & Z (Town Planner) about it (make a recommendation and/or advise on all matters). It was the consensus that it would not be practical to respond on all applications. An option might be to limit a response to an open space and/or conservation easement matter. We would not want to add another layer of bureaucracy to the process.

Commissioner Igielski noted that if the Town Engineer gets to see all applications, he could filter out the ones for review and comment by the Commission.

Alternate Harlow said there should be a trigger in the application process for having an application referred to the Conservation Commission for review and comment on a non-wetland matter.

Chairman Block said the trigger should be in place before the application is submitted. The statute mandates the authority but there is no mechanism in place to see that it is done.

NOTE: There was a general discussion on how to proceed on the matter (listen to audio tape for details).

Chairman Block, at the conclusion of the discussion, suggested that Commission members review the Statute and come back at the July meeting with a recommendation on how to approach the matter.

Motion made by Alternate Harlow to table the item over to the July meeting and was seconded by Alternate Turgeon. There was no discussion. Vote Was 5 yes, 0 no and the motion was carried.

ITEM VII

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

ITEM VIII

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

Alternate Harlow requested that the Commission get a list of Brownfield sites in Newington to see what can be done with them. He suggested that the web site address be sent to all members and maybe someone will be able to separate the Newington sites from the master list.

Motion made by Alternate Harlow to adjourn meeting at 8:10 p.m. and was seconded by Commissioner Schaffer. There was no discussion. Vote was 5 yes, 0 no and motion was carried.

Peter M. Arburr, Recording Secretary

Commission Members
Tayna Lane, Town Clerk
Town Manager John Salamone
Edmund Meehan, Town Planner
Councilor Myra Cohen
Chairperson, Town Plan and Zoning Commission

Anthony Ferraro, Town Engineer
Ben Ancona Jr., Esquire, Town Attorney
Lucy Robbins Wells Library (2)